



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOVEMBER MEETING, 1907.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 14th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the President in the chair.

The record of the October meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian read the list of donors to the Library during the past month.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of a letter from Professor Pasquale Villari in response to a minute adopted at the October meeting.

The Cabinet-Keeper reported the gift from the Cambridge Historical Society of their medal struck by Tiffany and Company of New York, from a design by Bela L. Pratt, to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. He also presented a medal of President Charles W. Eliot, designed by Leon Deschamps and struck at the French mint in 1907.

The President reported that the Council had appointed the President, Edward Stanwood, and James Ford Rhodes a Committee to publish the Proceedings of the Society, pending the choice of a permanent Editor to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Charles C. Smith.

The PRESIDENT then said:

As the chance concurrence of the ceremonies connected with the unveiling of the John Cotton Memorial with the date of our October meeting interfered with the regular order of our procedure at that meeting, the present is for all practical purposes our first meeting after the usual summer interim. The announcements which should have been made in October will be made to-day.

So far as the Society is concerned, the occurrence of most considerable importance during the five months of intermission has been the resignation of our Editor. The Society will remember that at our annual (April) meeting Mr. Smith declined re-election as Treasurer, retiring from the position held by him

through so many years. Mr. Lord was then chosen his successor; while a recognition of the outgoing Treasurer's continued and faithful services was spread upon our record. It appeared in the serial number of our Proceedings, laid upon the table at the October meeting. It was at the April meeting further intimated that Mr. Smith proposed to resign the position of Editor also. This he has since done in a letter dated June 1, thus closing another phase of service and term of long usefulness in connection with our Society. Mr. Smith's work as Editor began with his appointment by the Council on the 14th of November, 1889, and has since been continuous, thus covering a period of nearly eighteen years.

During those years, besides other services to the Society, Mr. Smith has edited thirteen volumes of our Collections,—from Vol. IV. of the Sixth Series to Vol. VI. of the Seventh Series,—both inclusive. He has also brought out sixteen volumes of our Proceedings, from the fifth to the twentieth of the Second Series. An aggregate of no less than twenty-nine printed volumes have thus received his editorial care. He had previously been a member of the Committee to publish the first and eighth volumes of our Fifth Series of Collections, and the third volume of our Sixth Series, together with nine volumes—tenth to eighteenth—of our First Series of Proceedings, and two volumes of Early Proceedings (1791–1855), making in all no less than forty-three volumes, either edited by him exclusively or in co-operation with others.

It hardly needs to be said that this record represents an amount of editorial work far exceeding, both in scope and value, that done by any other official or member ever connected with the Society. Mr. Smith's work, moreover, speaks for itself; painstaking, careful, accurate, suppressive of the editorial self, it has maintained the high standard traditionally borne by the publications of this Society.

I am unwilling also to close this testimony of mine to the character of Mr. Smith's work without especial reference to the volume of our Proceedings placed on the table at our last meeting,—the twentieth, and closing volume of our Second Series. In its general make-up, in the nature and value of its contents, it is in my judgment the fitting consummation of Mr. Smith's editorial labors,—in all respects, a model of what a publication of that character should be. The historical inter-

est of its contents is fully up to the mechanical excellence of the volume, and the editorial work is in keeping with both.

It is needless to say that the resignation of Mr. Smith leaves a void in the Society's organization difficult to fill. Connected with the Society by long membership, he had not only a familiarity with its publications possessed by no other person, but his personal acquaintance with its past membership and his knowledge of its traditions were peculiar and unequalled. These cannot be transmitted. Most important and valuable factors in our peculiar editorial work, they disappear with him. In these respects the void occasioned by Mr. Smith's withdrawal cannot be made good in any successor.

No new Editor has yet been decided on. The matter has, however, engaged, and is still engaging, the earnest attention of the Council, and a selection will, it is hoped, be made at a not remote day.

It now devolves on me to announce to the Society vacancies in our several rolls of membership, since the June meeting, greater in number than, I believe, were ever before announced at any single meeting. All caused by death, these vacancies, seven in all, have occurred in each of our rolls. Among our more immediate associates, Henry Gardner Denny, a member of the Society since the meeting of December 13, 1866, died in this city on the 19th of September; John Elliot Sanford, a member since the January meeting, 1884, died at his residence in Taunton on the 11th of last month; and, finally, Solomon Lincoln, a member since the November meeting, 1887, died in Boston four days later.

Connected with the Society for over forty years, Mr. Denny, though recently incapacitated from active work and even from attendance, was long not only a useful member, as Cabinet-Keeper and in service rendered on the various committees, but he was valuable as a contributor of historical matter. Chosen Cabinet-Keeper at the April meeting, 1868, he long filled that position. As Keeper he made six reports, all incorporated in our Proceedings, covering the years 1869 to 1874, inclusive. In 1868 and in 1869 he prepared other reports for the Committee on the Memorials of the Antiquities of Boston; and, in 1876, he made a report on the sale of Dr. Shurtleff's copy of the Bay Psalm Book. In 1891 he served on the Committee to audit the Treasurer's Accounts. His last

participation in our meetings was a tribute to that estimable and interesting man, John Wilson, of the University Press, at the May meeting of 1903. He not infrequently took active part in our discussions; his final attendance was at the April meeting of 1906. A Harvard graduate in the Class of 1852, Mr. Denny took his degree at the University Law School in 1854. At his death his name stood, in order of seniority, fifth on our Resident roll.

I shall presently call upon our associate Dr. Hale to pay tribute to Mr. Denny. The preparation of his memoir has been assigned to our associate Mr. Shaw.

Of Mr. Sanford there is little to be said in connection with the Society. Chosen a member on general principles, as representing Bristol County and the region in which he lived, he was an estimable man and useful citizen. Through a long series of years Mr. Sanford held many official positions of secondary character; but at no time did he identify himself with historical research, and I believe he never was present at more than one of our meetings. He certainly never served on any committee, nor, taking part in our discussions, contributed by so doing to our printed Proceedings. In 1891 he prepared a memoir of Rev. Henry M. Dexter.

Third to die since the June meeting, Solomon Lincoln had been twenty years, lacking one month, a member of the Society, and both a useful and an interested member. Elected in 1887, he in a way succeeded his father, after whom he was named, a member from January, 1845, to December, 1881. Not only was Mr. Lincoln to a certain extent the legal adviser of the Society, but through more than a dozen years he served on its committees, prepared reports, and otherwise interested himself in its work and well-being. Between 1892 and 1895 he was a member of the Council, and in the last year prepared its report. One of the more constant attendants at our meetings, on November 9, 1899, he paid a tribute to his classmate and lifelong friend, John C. Ropes, and later, on October 9, 1902, a similar tribute to Horace Gray. In 1902 he also prepared a memoir of Lincoln Flagg Brigham. Mr. Sanford and Mr. Lincoln were, however, both of them men of a most important and most useful type, — a type which constitutes in fact the saving element of our Anglo-Saxon community. Of education and ability, with a strong sense of self-respect and

personal obligation, they were public-spirited and faithful; above all, they were not eaten up with the craving for office and newspaper notoriety so unpleasantly characteristic of modern life. Useful citizens, they had character.

Of Solomon Lincoln in particular I could otherwise say much, for he and I had been friends during more than half a century, since in fact we had been fellow students in Harvard. We were not, however, graduated in the same year, he being of the class of 1857, while I had preceded him by one year. Friends in college, we had remained friends always since. For his abilities, judgment and character I had a profound respect; for him personally an affectionate regard. In my case his death has left a distinct sense of loss. I do not propose, however, to do more than refer to Mr. Lincoln here outside of his connection with the Society, but I shall presently call on his classmate, Governor Long, to pay fitting tribute to one whom he had known well in many capacities since they sat side by side on the college benches.

The name of David Masson has now for thirteen years stood at the head of our Honorary roll; and his election in 1871 preceded by twenty-five years that of Mr. Bryce, who now takes the vacated leadership as respects seniority. Dr. Masson died at Edinburgh on the 7th of the present month. Born in 1822, he was, when made an Honorary Member, in his forty-ninth year; but his reputation as an investigator was firmly established. Thirty years Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Edinburgh University, he was, from 1853 to 1865, the successor of Professor Clough in the chair of English Literature in the University College, London. Honorary Professor of Ancient History at the Royal Scottish Academy, in 1893 he received the appointment of Historiographer Royal for Scotland.

As an investigator and writer, Masson's name is inseparably connected with that of Milton, as author of the monumental work known as "The Life of John Milton: narrated in connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time." The first volume of this publication, great in every sense, appeared in 1859, and the sixth and last in 1880. When I say that in its line this work is unique, I speak not from general report but as one having authority; for some dozen or fifteen years ago I undertook to edit for the Prince Society a

volume relating to the famous Antinomian controversy, which between 1636 and 1638 convulsed the infant colony of Massachusetts Bay. In so doing I, of course, had occasion to make use of Dr. Masson's work. I can only say it then impressed me as an almost inexhaustible mine of recondite learning. To read it as literature was, I should admit, impossible; my recollection also is that it then lacked an index; but in it, somewhere, if the investigator had but patience to look, was everything relating to the period with which it dealt, and its controversies. It represents, in a word, an amount of learning based on careful investigation of original material connected with a single individual and environment illustrative of the time in which that individual lived, which, so far as my knowledge goes, is without a parallel. Nor was this conclusion peculiar to me; for, I remember, in one of the notes to his history, the late S. R. Gardiner, referring to some original material discovered by him in the archives, makes the assertion that, so far as he knew, it was the only bit of material of a similar character relating to that period which seemed to have escaped the prior search of Dr. Masson. His patience was inexhaustible; his assiduity and capacity for labor knew no limit. Chosen an Honorary Member before the recent rule as respects our Honorary list¹ was established, Dr. Masson, nevertheless, as an historical writer and investigator, came strictly within both the letter and spirit of that rule. In the field of historical study his was an international reputation, recognized and unquestioned.

In accordance with our present custom in the case of Honorary Members, I shall presently call on our associate Mr. Wendell to pay tribute to him. I had anticipated that Mr. Perry would also have had a word to add in this connection; but he has not been able to attend to-day.

Of our fifty Corresponding Members, the names of John Marshall Brown, chosen at the May meeting, 1879; John Andrew Doyle, chosen at the May meeting, 1887; and Sir Spencer Walpole, chosen at the December meeting, 1904, have disappeared from the roll as it stands in the recently published twentieth volume of our Proceedings. As the Society is aware, it is not usual to take special notice of the decease of Corresponding Members. Nevertheless, of those named, Mr.

¹ 2 Proceedings, xv. 51-54; xx. 396.

Doyle and Sir Spencer Walpole both rendered such conspicuous and valuable services in the historical line, and as the name of the former is so connected with our early American annals, it seems proper that exception should in their cases be made. I shall therefore call upon Professor Edward Channing, of Harvard, and Dr. Rhodes, to pay brief tributes, the first to Mr. Doyle and the second to Sir Spencer Walpole. I will merely myself say, in connection with the latter, that I regard Sir Spencer Walpole as the highest authority of which I have knowledge on the extremely intricate and very important European diplomatic complications of the period of our War of Secession, the years between 1860 and 1865. As bearing upon the important issue of European intervention in our internecine struggle, the full story of those complications has never yet been disclosed. I hope, at some future time, myself to contribute towards a more intimate understanding of it. I will now only say that, should I succeed in so doing, I shall be mainly indebted for my success to the investigations of Sir Spencer Walpole and his "History of Twenty-five Years." Though for some time I carried on more or less correspondence with Sir Spencer, and he rendered me essential service in connection with what I have written of the period and complications referred to, I never met him personally. It was otherwise with Dr. Rhodes. Only most recently he was Sir Spencer's guest, having thus had an opportunity to observe him in his chosen and distinctive character of the English country gentleman.

EDWARD E. HALE, having been called on first, read a tribute to Mr. Denny as follows:

In the death of Henry Gardner Denny the Society loses a member who was profoundly interested in our work, and for many years was an intelligent officer of the Society.

There was every reason which the heredity people would assign for his interest in the history of Massachusetts. On his mother's side he descended directly from Henry Gardner, the first treasurer of the State of Massachusetts under the Constitution of 1780, as he had been since 1774 the only treasurer of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, from the moment when that Province parted company with George the Third.

When Governor Gage dissolved the General Court of the

Province, it formed itself into a Provincial Congress, and on October 28, 1774, appointed Henry Gardner of Stow to act as receiver-general and treasurer. It instructed the people of the Commonwealth to pay their taxes to him instead of to Harrison Gray, who was the royal treasurer. Since that memorable vote no taxes have been paid in Massachusetts to the English Crown. It would seem as if Henry Gardner might be called the first person who by public act was instructed to commit high treason against the King. This Henry Gardner had graduated at Harvard College in 1750, and later was representative of the town of Stow, in the western part of Middlesex County. In 1778 he removed to Dorchester in Massachusetts. I think he was always called "Treasurer Gardner." His son, Dr. Henry Gardner, of Dorchester, was the grandfather of our friend.

I have named his descent from the Gardners first because he bore their name. His father, Mr. Daniel Denny, was himself a remarkable character in our Massachusetts history. Personally, I have reason for speaking of him with enthusiasm, because long before Henry Denny was born, when I was a little boy, I remember Daniel Denny in my father's house. For he was one of the little cluster of insane fanatics who believed with my father that what they called a railway was practicable and desirable between Boston and Albany. By people at large they were considered as madmen, and indeed were abused as such in public assemblies. As late as 1827 I find the following interesting passage in a report to the Massachusetts legislature: "A railway is a carriage road so formed that the wheels move on rails of any hard surface of iron, wood, or stone, instead of forming ruts or tracks."

Mr. Daniel Denny was one of these insane men. It is the fashion now to speak of them as plutocrats who assume by their wealth the command of the resources of the country; but they were not spoken of so then. He was born in Leicester, and was one of the old Leicester family of Denny, who from the early days were distinguished in the history of Worcester County.

Mr. Henry G. Denny's mother, Harriet Joanna (Gardner) Denny, as I have said, was the daughter of Dr. Henry Gardner, who was the son of the treasurer. Mr. Denny, our associate, was the eldest son of Daniel Denny. He was born

on June 12, 1833. He was fitted for Harvard College at the Chauncy Hall School, and in 1848, at the age of fifteen, he entered college.

The class has distinguished itself in various walks of life, and I am glad to see present with us contemporaries who will testify to his life-long interest in the University. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and the present members of that society will be eager to express their gratitude for his services in its varied administration. Almost from the moment of his graduation until he was disabled by illness of late years, he was ready for service in any line in which he could lift where he stood. He was utterly careless as to title or public reputation; if he could be of use, he made himself so.

He studied law in the Law School and with the late Francis Watts. He was a member of the American Academy, of which Treasurer Gardner was one of the founders. Somebody said that for the generation of his active life, he was the Boston Library, — meaning that he watched over the interests of the old Boston Library in every detail and made it the admirable and important institution which it is. It would be almost impossible to tell of how many philanthropic societies he was the careful and trusted treasurer. He was chosen into this Society in 1866; he was for many years our Cabinet-Keeper, and served on various committees.

In the critical years before the Civil War he could be relied upon by the leaders in anti-slavery opinion for any service, private or public. I should find it hard to say when Henry Denny was at his best, but he was never more entertaining than he was if you could start him in private on describing the duties of young volunteers whose business it was to protect Wendell Phillips and Lloyd Garrison at one and another public meeting. He was an active member of Salignac's drill corps through the war. I remember a phrase of his there when he was disappointed by some failure in the meeting of a company, "Let us drill in the manual; no man was ever perfect enough in the manual," — a phrase which, whether true or not, gives a perfect illustration of the accuracy of his daily life.

Mr. Denny, from early life, was a careful student of the English language. I do not quite understand why I find no printed papers of his in our own library or in our own trans-

actions which would illustrate his interest in good English. His private library was especially strong in such English and American books as illustrate the growth of our language from Chaucer's time down. And that was a hardy man who dared enter into discussion with him on any matter of detail regarding spelling, or local habits, or what one might call the "annals" of the English language. His grief when the press failed in such matters was always amusing, and a young author was fortunate who could obtain his advice. There are almost unnumbered citations of his gifts to the Society in the indexes to our Proceedings. But one looks in vain for what he would be glad to find, — his vigorous and terse comments on written history or on passing events.

JOHN D. LONG paid the following tribute to Mr. Lincoln :

Solomon Lincoln, who was born in August, 1838, and who died last month, entered the class of 1857, at Harvard, at the beginning of its second year. From that time on to his graduation he and I sat side by side on the recitation benches, he preceding me in alphabetical order as he did in rank and date of birth. He quickly and easily rose to his level and, when Joseph May by reason of ill health left college in our senior year, became our first scholar. His characteristics then were his characteristics all through life, — well tempered, quick in apprehension, mature in character, of a singularly orderly habit, high-minded, a model of deportment yet full of humor and open to all the innocent and rational enjoyments and good times of life, winning the absolute confidence of associates and authorities, and equal to whatever trust or duty came to him. I recall him at that time, short and fair, a handsome youth with frank face and honest eyes and always a bearing that united personal dignity with courteous and kindly manner. He had a mind that worked with easy and accurate directness to results and achievement. I should not say that he was a hard student in the sense of a dig or grind, if I may use those college phrases, but a masterful and sure one, always superior to his task and giving himself the broader range which made him socially a delightful and contributory comrade. And his life was pure as crystal.

I see before me now that picture of the ideal youth. I see another, the same picture but enlarged and developed, — the

man in the prime of life, active in his profession, — charged with large interests and trusts as a leader at the bar and with the wider responsibilities which are put upon the wise and trusted citizen who does not seek, but is sought for, posts in civic and social life. His special distinction was in his career as a lawyer. In this he rose to the heights. He had eminently a judicial mind and was a thorough student and master of the law. I had the honor to offer him a place on the bench. Had he accepted it, it is in my mind beyond question that he would have been promoted to the supreme judicial court and would later have served and died as its chief. His range of practice was large. He was counsel for some of our largest corporate interests at a time, which I trust may return, when nobody questioned the respectability of employment by a corporation. He was recognized as an especially wise and safe adviser in chambers. He was also one of the most busily engaged advocates before juries and the judges. In this arena his example was a liberal education to other practitioners, to not only the younger men but men of his own age and length of professional life. To him and some contemporaries like him are due the better than the old manners of the bar, the more courteous conduct of cases and the transition from the brutal treatment of witnesses and the repulsive bickering between opposing counsel, which at one time were regarded as the mark of the smart and popular lawyer.

His manner was always that of a gentleman. He was straightforward, earnest, and honest. His preparation was complete both in the law and in the facts. There was no subterfuge or trick or sharp practice. His adversary's rights were safe in his hands, but his adversary's defence must be well guarded and strong in order to escape his thoroughness and fidelity to his cause. No client ever had more loyal or painstaking counsel. As a natural result, he ranked high in the small group of not only the leading but the best lawyers in every sense of the word.

He was for years president of the Bar Association. His name was a synonym for the ideals of his profession. Alas, that in that profession, so vital an element in the complicated relations of life, its brightest ornaments are so soon forgotten, and that, if you or I were to name even at a bar meeting any one of the leaders of the bar fifty years ago, whose fame was

then on everybody's lips, whose arguments attracted great crowds, and the scintillations of whose wit were quoted like household words, it would be to most of our hearers as unknown and as unmeaning as if it were a name on a selectman's door plate in the North End of Boston a century ago!

And I recall the picture of Solomon Lincoln as we saw him in his seventh decade, sitting in this room, one of our fellow members. And yet I do not recall him more freshly than before, for memory is an annihilator of time as the electric current is of space. Under its magic the mind's eye sees all the past in one photograph with the present, still living and fresh and now and here. So the figure before me is still one and the same, the youthful classmate, the mature and active lawyer, the veteran retiring from the battle front to these cloisters of historic quiet and occupation-seeking leisure. In these latter days bodily infirmities had sapped his physical strength, though leaving unimpaired the attractive face, the genial manner, the conversational cordiality and interest. In these latter years, too, he had let go the former absorbing hold of professional duties. Partly in search of health, largely in pursuit of more varied and cosmopolitan knowledge of men and the world, he had travelled extensively through Europe, in Egypt (in which he specially delighted), and through our own West and Pacific coast.

Even in his most active professional days his life was not narrow, and he did not fail to render the service due from the good citizen. He never gave himself to a political career in the way of holding political office; and yet few men were more vitally interested in the political questions and exactions of the day. He had very decided convictions in this respect. He was not a hanger on the fence. He was an unusually devoted and loyal party man, a stanch Republican, and argued his party's case strenuously and sometimes with intense earnestness.

He served on the staff of Governor Talbot, to whom he was also a wise and influential counsellor. It is not for me to give the detailed statistics of the places he filled, or indeed of his general career; but I cannot refrain, in sight of these shelves rich with historic treasures, from referring to his long service as one of the trustees of the Boston Public Library. He was president of the Unitarian Club, thereby expressing his sym-

pathy with the liberal religious faith in which he was born and reared, and with its steadily liberalizing and more and more free, untrammelled thought. He was for many terms president of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, in which, after his graduation therefrom, he had been an instructor.

In the social life of Boston he was a charm and a contributor. Many a circle recalls his rare combination of sound sense, large culture, and happy humor. At our Jacobite Club, — a club of some of his classmates named for its founder, our former member here, John Codman Ropes, *clarum nomen*, — he was delightful in his reminiscences of college life. He reinvested them with the old phrases and tones, notably those of dear old Dr. Walker, president of the college in our time. And not only his reminiscences, but his comments on current men and things, and his part in the lively discussions which of course always arose on current men and things, were marked by that singular directness and good sense and wholesome view which were characteristic of him.

He was not a brilliant man in the pyrotechnic sense or perhaps in a less resplendent sense, but he was all aglow with the steady and unflickering flame of a mind that always blazed clear. He was not an eloquent advocate in the sense of the thundering orator or scintillating rhetorician, but his speech was convincing and went straight to the heart of the issue. He never put himself in the lime-light of a popular figure, but he was an unfailing influence for good and wholesome things, and the world was better for his part in it. He was singularly free from anything smacking of sensationalism or claptrap. Some good men offend you by the apparent consciousness on their own part of their virtues and of the favor they bestow upon you in giving you an opportunity to observe them. There was nothing of this sort in Lincoln. One of the quaint rural philosophers of my boyhood in Maine — an inglorious but not mute Shakespeare rather than Milton — used to say of any person whom he regarded as a man of worth, "He was born right." Lincoln in his commendable career and example was simply giving unconscious expression to the natural qualities of his mind and heart.

His home, his domestic life, that great living-room of his, with its wealth of books, its rare pictures on the wall, and its notable collection of photographs gathered during native and

foreign travel and illustrative of European, Egyptian, oriental, and insular scenes, and reproducing distant clime, landscape, costume, and building, — all these and that hospitable table, around which it has been the delight of so many to sit in conversé and comradeship, attest the memory of a private life radiant, liberal, refined, without a stain, the outcome of a pure heart and clean hands.

A native of Hingham, he inherited the flavor of that ancient town and community, and was a Puritan with the Puritan's virtues and none of the Puritan's narrowness. His ancestors of his own famous name of Lincoln were among its very first settlers. His father was its leading citizen, historian of the town, and the son came naturally by historical tastes which attracted him to this Society. The father delivered the oration at the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town; the son, at that of the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth.

It was an all-round life, the full corn in the ear. It certainly was a fortunate and blessed life in its birth, its education, its work, its fruition. Some of you were present in the room to which I have referred, when the last tributes were paid to him. There he lay at rest, embowered in flowers, silent but still with us. The funeral service, the best ordered perhaps because the simplest I ever attended, was in keeping with the man. A room full of friends gathered, not in a chilling temple but around him in his home, into the windows of which the sunlight streamed. A fitting prayer from the lips of his pastor, so impressive in figure and voice and octogenarian years, so fertile and versatile, — a living statue, in the flesh, of the Massachusetts Minute-man of our time, — Edward Everett Hale; and then a few verses, recited by the younger associate minister, from the "Eternal Goodness" of Whittier, — the one poet who has best and most enduringly embodied the spiritual and household heart of New England. Simplicity and sincerity were the best eulogy of the man, because they were the man himself.

I join, Mr. President, gratefully in the tribute which you and all here pay to the memory of this our beloved fellow member.

BARRETT WENDELL followed with a tribute to Professor Masson:

On the 15th of August, 1871, a stated meeting of this Society was held, postponed from the 10th in order to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Sir Walter Scott, formerly an Honorary Member. At this meeting "David Masson, A.M., of Edinburgh, author of the new *Life of Milton*, was elected a Corresponding Member." Few chances could have been happier than that which thus associates Masson, in our records, at once with the greatest master of Scottish letters and with his own most surely enduring work.

At that time he was nearly fifty years old. Born at Aberdeen, on the 2d of December, 1822, and educated first at Marischal College there, and later at Edinburgh, under Dr. Chalmers, he had already had a wide and varied career, — as editor of the "*Free Kirk Banner*" at Aberdeen, as a literary associate of the Chamberses in Edinburgh, as a general man of letters in London, where his sympathy with liberty had made him for a while Secretary of the "*Friends of Italy*," as the successor of Arthur Hugh Clough in the chair of English literature at University College, London, and as the first editor of "*Macmillan's Magazine*," an excellent periodical which came to its end in the very year when he died. For six years before his election to this Society he had been the successor of Sir William Edmonstoune Aytoun in the chair of Rhetoric and English Literature at the University of Edinburgh.

Yet the "*new Life of Milton*," in recognition of which he was elected here, had by no means reached completion. The first volume had appeared in 1859; the second had only just come out in 1871. The work was not fully finished until 1880. Meanwhile, in March, 1875, when he is recorded not as A.M. but as LL.D., his name had been transferred from our Corresponding to our Honorary list. Since the death of Froude, in October, 1894, he stood at the head of this list.

Few if any of the present members of the Society have personally known him. To us he was an eminent man of letters. He was the author of many works of which we had no very clear impression, — among them essays on a wide variety of subjects, and authoritative books on Chatterton and on Drummond of Hawthornden; and — what associated him somewhat more closely with New England — he was the editor of the standard edition of the works of Thomas De Quincey, whose writings, if I mistake not, had first been collected by our

fellow-townsmen, the late James T. Fields. Supremely, however, Masson remained what he had already shown himself in 1871, — the final biographer of Milton.

His great work, as it rounded into its portentous bulk, proved to be, and will probably remain, one of the three great though dissimilar works which will record in monumental literature the history of England during the seventeenth century. Almost, if not quite, it bridges the gap between Gardiner and Macaulay. Though it lack something of the unswerving precision of the one, and of the fervid brilliancy of the other, it has at the same time, together with its discursive individuality, a touch of both these qualities. It is quite as much a picture of the times of Milton as it is the story of his life. Yet Milton remains the central figure throughout its six solid volumes. And this is why there has been such peculiar fitness in the fact of Masson's standing for so long as the eldest Honorary Member of this Society; for of all the great masters of English literature none comes so near as Milton to that type of character from which the most vital traditions of New England have been derived.

Though to us, across seas, Masson was chiefly a great historical biographer, his work as a professor perhaps more instantly appealed to those who knew him in Edinburgh. English literature has been neglected by the great universities of England. In Scotland, as in Continental Europe and in America, it is regarded as a subject of full academic dignity; and Masson, as the chief professor of it in Scotland, was recognized, I think, as the chief in the English-speaking world.

Among his pupils was my colleague, Professor William Allan Neilson, of Harvard University. He has had the kindness to send me some notes of his memories, which I shall venture to put down here:

For thirty years he lectured every afternoon to a large body of students, devoting the remainder of his energy to the production of those works of solid and enduring scholarship which have brought him fame. As a teacher, Masson was a memorable and impressive figure, regarded by the younger generations of Edinburgh alumni with profound reverence and affection. In this field it was his personality, more than his learning, which told, — a personality as rugged and massive as the granite of his native hills. The intensity of his appreciation of the greater figures in literature, the order of his patriotism

and the warmth of his genial humor, brought forth from time to time bursts of eloquence which remain in the minds of many as the most vivid memories of their college days. . . .

In physical appearance Masson came more and more to bear a striking resemblance to his friend and fellow-countryman, Thomas Carlyle. In their writings there is more than a superficial resemblance of style: they had in common a passion for truth, a capacity for enormous labor in the search for it, and a large share of the preferred genius of their race in the defence of it. In Masson's death literature and history in Scotland lose their veteran representative.

One final anecdote may remind us of how fortunate the choice of Scott's centenary was for Masson's election here. At least in his later years, they say, he was accustomed to read his lectures from manuscripts written out once for all. The bursts of eloquence, I take it, were frequently interspersed. In one of his lectures, however, when he touched on Scott, I have been told, he regularly broke off, year by year, with some such words as these: "And at this point I am accustomed to remark that if I could live forever I should ask for no happier eternity than one gladdened by a perpetual series of Waverley Novels."

EDWARD CHANNING spoke as follows:

Mr. President, it was a very happy idea on your part to break through our ordinary practice, as to Corresponding Members, and to spread upon our records an appreciation of John Andrew Doyle's labors in our special field. Like so many subjects of Queen Victoria interested in American history, Doyle was not an Englishman, but was of Irish descent. In casting about as to why he should have interested himself in American history, his racial origin seemed perhaps to be one of the reasons. Mr. Doyle's father was the editor of "The London Chronicle" for a great many years, and his mother was the daughter of the proprietor of that paper. The Chronicle in the eighteenth century—the predecessor, of course, of the Chronicle of the Doyle period—was a nonconformist paper, and was singularly taken up with American affairs. It may be that the connection of the Doyle family with the Chronicle was what turned his attention to American history. At all events, in 1869 Mr. Doyle won the Arnold prize at

Oxford. This essay was printed in that year, the subject being "The American Colonies Previous to the Declaration of Independence." I think it is very interesting to notice that Mr. Doyle — a student at Oxford who had never been in America at that time, and had, so far as I know, no American roots of any sort — should have taken that subject for his prize essay; possibly it may have been assigned to him. At all events, it was a happy chance that turned him in the direction of the history of our growth. From that time to his death he spent all his life, or a very large part of it, in studying and writing about our early annals. He printed five volumes on the history of American colonies, the first volume being on "Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas," followed, in 1887, by two volumes on "The Puritan Colonies," which in turn were followed, within the last twelve months, by a volume on "The Middle Colonies" and one on "The Colonies under the House of Hanover."

Mr. Doyle's two volumes on "The Puritan Colonies" are a remarkable piece of work. That an Englishman who had never been in this country except for a few weeks could have got hold of the spirit of New England colonization and New England thought in the way he did, is very noteworthy. Mr. Doyle's two volumes on the New England colonies are one of the very best studies that we have on the subject. He had the use of the documents in the State Paper Office in London, and also of the papers in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. He added something to our store of knowledge from original sources, but not very much. The important thing about his work is the comment and the treatment of our history from an outside standpoint. I think Mr. Doyle did a great service in that way. As an Englishman, a member of the Established Church, and Librarian of All Souls College in Oxford, he took a view of New England history which none of us can take; and it is very good that that view should have been perpetuated in book form.

Mr. Doyle had some of the idiosyncrasies of English writers. Among other things, he used certain sets of books, and then did not use certain other sets, in the way which English students do, but which is to us very puzzling. He studied our Collections with great faithfulness, but in writing these volumes did not look into our Proceedings at all. He used Winthrop's "History," but made no use whatever of

the Boston Records. From the point of view of a descendant of Thomas Dudley and Anne Bradstreet, the result was to give a Winthropian cast to Massachusetts history which is somewhat distressing. That, I think, is the greatest failing of Mr. Doyle's books on New England. Otherwise they are good, wholesome reading for any New Englander.

The last two volumes of Mr. Doyle's works have not held the place of the New England volumes. When I read them, last spring, I came across a note, — one of the foot-notes to a page, — "Here I regret to say that, as in two previous instances, I have mislaid my references." It then occurred to me that Mr. Doyle must be approaching his end. He had evidently looked for the reference and had not found it, and thought it necessary to say that he could not find it; but this honesty was characteristic of the man.

Mr. Doyle contributed numberless notices of American books to the "English Historical Review," and wrote many of the articles on American Colonists for the "Dictionary of National Biography." He kept us before the English historical public as no one else has done in recent years. He was the principal writer in the volume on the United States in "The Cambridge Modern History." The book, however, that I would like to call attention to in closing is none of these, and probably is one that most of you here have not seen, — his "History of the United States" in that most arid series of histories edited by Edward A. Freeman, which began with a "General Sketch" by Mr. Freeman himself. Doyle's book covers the whole period of United States history, and it is such a good statement, — it is dry, fearfully dry, — but it is such a good statement of our history, the facts are given with such appreciation and generally with such accuracy, that the students of American history in Harvard University have literally used up the copy of that book in its library. Part of the volume has disappeared bodily. It seems to me that this is the greatest tribute perhaps that can be paid to John Andrew Doyle's scholarly knowledge of the history of our country.

JAMES F. RHODES read an estimate of Sir Spencer Walpole:

Sir Spencer Walpole was an excellent historian and industrious writer. His first important work, entitled "The History

of England" from 1815, was published at intervals from 1878 to 1886; the first instalment appeared when he was thirty-nine years old. This in six volumes carried the history to 1858 in an interesting, accurate, and impartial narrative. Four of the five chapters of the first volume are entitled "The Material Condition of England in 1815," "Society in England," "Opinion in 1815," "The Last of the Ebb Tide," and they are masterly in their description and relation. During the Napoleonic wars business was good. The development of English manufactures, due largely to the introduction of steam as a motive power, was marked. "Twenty years of war," he wrote, "had concentrated the trade of the world in the British Empire." Wheat was dear; in consequence the country gentlemen received high rents. The clergy, being largely dependent on tithes, — the tenth of the produce, — had their incomes increased as the price of corn advanced. But the laboring classes, both those engaged in manufactures and agriculture, did not share in the general prosperity. Either their wages did not rise at all or did not advance commensurate with the increase of the cost of living and the decline in the value of the currency. Walpole's detailed and thorough treatment of this subject is historic work of high value.

In the third volume I was much impressed with his account of the Reform Act of 1832. We all have read that wonderful story over and over again, but I doubt whether its salient points have been better combined and presented than in Walpole's chapter. I had not remembered the reason of the selection of Lord John Russell to present the bill in the House of Commons when he was only Paymaster of the Forces without a seat in the Cabinet. It will of course be recalled that Lord Grey, the Prime Minister, was in the House of Lords, and, not so readily I think, that Althorp was Chancellor of the Exchequer and the leader of the House of Commons. On Althorp, under ordinary circumstances, it would have been incumbent to take charge of this highly important measure, which had been agreed upon by the Cabinet after counsel with the King. Russell was the youngest son of the Duke of Bedford; and the Duke was one of the large territorial magnates and the proprietor of rotten boroughs. "A bill recommended by his son's authority," wrote Walpole, "was likely to reassure timid or wavering politicians." "Russell,"

Walpole continued, "told his tale in the plainest language. But the tale which he had to tell required no extraordinary language to adorn it. The Radicals had not dared to expect, the Tories, in their wildest fears, had not apprehended, so complete a measure. Enthusiasm was visible on one side of the House; consternation and dismay on the other. At last, when Russell read the list of boroughs which were doomed to extinction, the Tories hoped that the completeness of the measure would ensure its defeat. Forgetting their fears, they began to be amused and burst into peals of derisive laughter" (Vol. III. p. 208).

Walpole's next book was the "Life of Lord John Russell," two volumes published in 1889. This was undertaken at the request of Lady Russell, who placed at his disposal a mass of private and official papers and "diaries and letters of a much more private nature." She also acceded to his request that she was not to see the biography until it was ready for publication, so that the whole responsibility of it would be Walpole's alone. The Queen gave him access to three bound volumes of Russell's letters to herself, and sanctioned the publication of certain letters of King William IV. Walpole wrote the biography in about two years and a half; and this, considering that at the time he held an active office, displayed unusual industry. If I may judge the work by a careful study of the chapter on "The American Civil War," it is a valuable contribution to political history.

Passing over three minor publications, we come to Walpole's "History of Twenty-five Years," two volumes of which were published in 1904. A brief extract from his preface is noteworthy, written as it is by a man of large intelligence, with great power of investigation and continuous labor and possessed of a sound judgment. After a reference to his "History of England" from 1815, he said: "The time has consequently arrived when it ought to be as possible to write the History of England from 1857 to 1880, as it was twenty years ago to bring down the narrative of that History to 1856 or 1857. . . . So far as I am able to judge, most of the material which is likely to be available for British history in the period with which these two volumes are concerned [1856-1870] is already accessible. It is not probable that much which is wholly new remains unavailable." I read carefully these two volumes

when they first appeared and found them exceedingly fascinating. Palmerston and Russell, Gladstone and Disraeli, are made so real that we follow their contests as if we ourselves had a hand in them. A half dozen or more years ago an Englishman told me that Palmerston and Russell were no longer considered of account in England. But I do not believe one can rise from reading these volumes without being glad of a knowledge of these two men whose patriotism was of a high order. Walpole's several characterizations, in a summing up of Palmerston, display his knowledge of men. "Men pronounced Lord Melbourne indifferent," he wrote, "Sir Robert Peel cold, Lord John Russell uncertain, Lord Aberdeen weak, Lord Derby haughty, Mr. Gladstone subtle, Lord Beaconsfield unscrupulous. But they had no such epithet for Lord Palmerston. He was as earnest as Lord Melbourne was indifferent, as strong as Lord Aberdeen was weak, as honest as Lord Beaconsfield was unscrupulous. Sir Robert Peel repelled men by his temper; Lord John Russell by his coldness; Lord Derby offended them by his pride; Mr. Gladstone distracted them by his subtlety. But Lord Palmerston drew both friends and foes together by the warmth of his manners and the excellence of his heart" (Vol. I. p. 525).

Walpole's knowledge of continental politics was apparently thorough. At all events, if one desires two entrancing tales, let him read the chapter on "The Union of Italy," of which Cavour and Napoleon III. are the heroes; and the two chapters entitled "The Growth of Prussia and the Decline of France" and "The Fall of the Second Empire." In these two chapters Napoleon III. again appears, but Bismarck is the hero. Walpole's chapter on "The American Civil War" is the writing of a broad-minded, intelligent man, who could look on two sides.

Of Walpole's last book, "Studies in Biography," published in 1907, I have left myself no time to speak. If any one is interested in it, let him read the review of it in "The Nation" early this year, which awards it high and unusual commendation.

The readers of Walpole's histories may easily detect in them a treatment not possible from a mere closet student of books and manuscripts. A knowledge of the science of government and of practical politics is there. For Walpole was of a political family. He was of the same house as the great Whig

Prime Minister Sir Robert; and his father was Home Secretary in the Lord Derby ministry of 1858, and again in 1866, when he had to deal with the famous Hyde Park meeting of July 23. On his mother's side he was a grandson of Spencer Perceval, the Prime Minister who in 1812 was assassinated in the lobby of the House of Commons. Walpole's earliest publication was a biography of Perceval.

And Spencer Walpole himself was a man of affairs. A clerk in the War Office in 1858, private secretary to his father in 1866, next year Inspector of Fisheries, later Lieutenant-Governor of the Isle of Man, and from 1893 to 1899 Secretary to the Post-Office. In spite of all this administrative work his books show that he was a wide, general reader, apart from his special historical studies. He wrote in an agreeable literary style, with Macaulay undoubtedly as his model, although he was by no means a slavish imitator. His "History of Twenty-five Years" seems to me written with a freer hand than the earlier history. He is animated by the spirit rather than the letter of Macaulay. I no longer noticed certain tricks of expression which one catches so easily in a study of the great historian, and which seem to fit so well Macaulay's own work, but that of nobody else.

An article by Walpole on my first four volumes, in the "Edinburgh Review" of January, 1901, led to a correspondence which resulted in an invitation last May to pass Sunday with him at Hartfield Grove, his Sussex country place. We were to meet at Victoria Station and take an early morning train. Seeing Mr. Frederic Harrison the day previous, I asked for a personal description of his friend Walpole in order that I might easily recognize the gentleman whom I had never met. "Well," says Harrison, "perhaps I can guide you. A while ago I sat next to a lady during a dinner who took me for Walpole and never discovered her mistake until addressing me as Sir Spencer I undeceived her just as the ladies were retiring from the table. Now I am eight years older, and I don't think I look like Walpole, but that good lady had another opinion." Walpole and Harrison met that Saturday evening at the Academy dinner, and Walpole obtained a personal description of myself. This caution on both our parts was unnecessary. We were the only historians travelling down on the train and could not possibly have missed one another. I found him a thoroughly

genial man, and after fifteen minutes in the railway carriage we were well acquainted. The preface to his "History of Twenty-five Years" told that the two volumes were the work of five years. I asked him how he was getting on with the succeeding volumes. He replied that he had done a good deal of work on them, and now that he was no longer in an administrative position he could concentrate his efforts and he expected to have the work finished before long. I inquired if the prominence of his family in politics hampered him at all in writing so nearly contemporary history, and he said, "Not a bit." An hour of the railroad and a half-hour's drive brought us to his home. It was not an ancestral place, but a purchase not many years back. An old house had been remodelled with modern improvements, and comfort and ease were the predominant aspects. Sir Spencer proposed a "turn" before luncheon, which meant a short walk, and after luncheon we had a real walk. I am aware that the English mile and our own are alike 5280 feet, but I am always impressed with the fact that the English mile seems longer, and so I was on this Sunday. For after a good two hours' exertion over hills and meadows my host told me that we had gone only five miles. Only by direct question did I elicit the fact that had he been alone he would have done seven miles in the same time.

There were no other guests, and Lady Walpole, Sir Spencer, and I had all of the conversation at luncheon and dinner and during the evening. We talked about history and literature, English and American politics and public men. He was singularly well informed about our country, although he had only made one brief visit and then in an official capacity. English expressions of friendship are now so common that I will not quote even one of the many scattered through his volumes, but he displayed everywhere a candid appreciation of our good traits and creditable doings. I was struck with his knowledge and love of lyric poetry. Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Longfellow, and Lowell were thoroughly familiar to him. He would repeat some favorite passage of Keats, and at once turn to a discussion of the administrative details of his work in the Post-Office. Of course the day and evening passed very quickly, — it was one of the days to be marked with a white stone, — and when I bade Walpole good-bye on the Monday morning I felt as if I were parting from a warm friend. I

found him broad-minded, intelligent, sympathetic, affable, and he seemed as strong physically as he was sound intellectually. His death on Sunday, July 7, of cerebral hemorrhage was alike a shock and a grief.

The President reported, for the Council, that Samuel S. Shaw had been appointed to write a memoir of Henry G. Denny; Morton Dexter, a memoir of John E. Sanford; John D. Long, a memoir of Solomon Lincoln; and Edward Stanwood, a memoir of Peleg W. Chandler.

The President called attention to a bust of George Bancroft by R. S. Greenough, which had been placed on the table to be presented at the next meeting of the Society; and he announced that M. A. DeWolfe Howe, through whose exertions it had been secured, would then give the curious history of its discovery.

Edward Stanwood communicated for ALBERT MATTHEWS, who was absent, the following paper:

DOCUMENTS IN A FILE OF THE BOSTON NEWS-LETTER (1711-1715) IN THE BOSTON ATHENÆUM.

Having recently had occasion to examine with some thoroughness Boston newspapers between 1704 and 1780, I found two volumes to which particular interest attaches. One, formerly owned by Judge Sewall and now owned by the New York Historical Society, contains an almost complete file of "The Boston News-Letter" from the first issue of April 24, 1704, to April 19, 1708. It was described by Dr. Green at the meeting of this Society held in November, 1890.¹ The other, now owned by the Boston Athenæum, contains a file of the "News-Letter" almost complete from February 19, 1710-11, to October 17, 1715. It was given to the Boston Athenæum in 1819 by Marshall B. Spring. It contains notes in ink, all apparently in the same hand. The only note that throws any light on the possible writer is one at the bottom of the second page of the issue of October 6, 1712, which reads:

Samuel Green the Son of Barthol & Jane Green was born Satterday Octob^r 4th [the 4 is blotted, evidently written over] about 4. p.m. Wakefield Midwife Was baptised Lords-Day Octob^r 5. p.m. P^r y^e Rever^d Mr. Ebenezer Pemberton in y^e South-Meetinghouse. Laus Deo.

¹ 2 Proceedings, vi. 171-174.

It would not be unreasonable to infer that the writer was Bartholomew Green, the printer of the "News-Letter" from April 24, 1704, to November 7, 1707, and again from October 8, 1711, to December 28, 1732, on which day he died. Green's own signature, however, attached to his will (dated 1732) is apparently different from that in the note. On the other hand, a comparison of the writing with the original of Sewall's Diary shows almost conclusively that the note given above was written by Sewall. Yet why, it may be asked, should Sewall be so minute in entering this particular birth? An explanation is not far to seek. In his Diary (II. 363) for 1712 occur these entries:

Octob^r 4. Satterday, About 4 p.m. Cousin Green is brought to Bed of a Son. Sam. Kneeland told me of it, to whom I gave a shilling.
Octob^r 5. Mr. Pemberton baptiseth this little son, whom his Father named Samuel.

It seems probable that the child was named after Sewall, and it is certain that the child's mother was a relative of his. On June 16, 1710, Bartholomew Green married for his second wife Jane Tappan; and the marriage ceremony was performed by Judge Sewall.¹ Jane Tappan was no doubt the daughter of Sewall's sister Hannah and her husband Jacob Tappan (or Toppan), of Newbury. Hence the bride was a niece of the Judge. It is needless to point out that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the word "cousin" meant almost any relationship, but more especially indicated a nephew or niece.

But whoever owned the volume, its chief interest lies in the documents that are bound in with the newspapers. Dr. Green described six such documents in the volume owned by the New York Historical Society. The Boston Athenæum volume has no fewer than fourteen, and once had fifteen. In a communication to this Society made in October, 1864, on "Catalogues of Harvard University," Sibley, speaking of the Triennial Catalogues, said: "A few years since, I found an excellent copy of the one for 1715, bound near the middle of a volume of the 'Boston News Letter' of that year, which is in the Library of the Boston Athenæum. Being of the same size as the newspaper, it had till then escaped observation."² This catalogue is no longer in the volume. As such documents are sometimes

¹ Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, xxviii. 45.

² 1 Proceedings, viii. 31.

mistaken for supplements, perhaps I may be allowed to repeat a remark recently written elsewhere :

The matter of supplements raises another difficult point. Many files of newspapers were formed years or even generations ago, and bound in with the newspapers themselves are copies of proclamations, declarations, poems, elegies, satirical skits, political pieces, and other documents of various kinds. Valuable and sometimes unique copies of documents have been preserved in this unexpected manner. But such documents are not supplements. It may be laid down as a safe rule that every genuine supplement of a newspaper has a heading or an imprint by which its identity can be established. This heading is sometimes, but by no means always, followed by a number which generally (though not always) corresponds with the number of the main issue of the same date.¹

A description of the documents bound in the Boston Athenæum volume follows :

I. After the issue of August 11, 1712, is a broadside containing a Latin poem in thirty-three lines headed " Martij 27. 1712." They are addressed to Sewall, are signed "*N. Hobart*," — the Rev. Nehemiah Hobart (H. C. 1667), — and are followed by two Latin lines signed "S. S."

II. After the issue of November 30, 1713, is a broadside, at the top of which is an elaborate "engraved head, or mourning piece." The description of this given by William R. Deane in the "*New England Historical and Genealogical Register*" (XXII. 140, 141) for April, 1868, need not be repeated here. Then follow the lines :

An ELEGY in Memory of the Worshipful | Major Thomas Leonard Esq. | Of *Taunton* in *New England* ; Who departed this Life on the 24th. Day of *November*, | *Anno Domini* 1713. In the 73d. Year of his Age.

This elegy, printed in two columns, was written by the Rev. Samuel Danforth (H. C. 1683) of Taunton. The poem was alluded to in 1794 by the Rev. Peres Fobes as "an eulogy,"² and was reprinted by Deane from the original in the volume under discussion. There is no imprint.

¹ Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, ix. 404, 405.

² 1 Collections, iii. 173.

III. After the issue of December 7, 1713, is a broadside having at the top an "engraved head, or mourning piece" closely resembling that of No. II. Then come the lines:

On the DEATH of the very Learned, Pious and Excelling | Gershom Bulkley Esq. M.D. | Who had his Mortality swallowed up of Life, *December the Second 1713. Ætatis Suae 78.* | Sanctus erat Quaquam Lucas, Medicusque Sepulchri, | Jura subit, factus Victima dira necis: | *A Saint tho' Luke, and a Physician too, | Struck Sail to Death, as other Mortals do.*

The text is printed in two columns, the first containing three stanzas. The top of the second column has, unfortunately, been cut out. Then comes the word "**Aliter**" followed by two stanzas, and then these lines:

Sic mihi contingat vivere sicque Mori

Johannes Jamesius

Brookfield Decemb.

7. 1713.

LONDINENSIS.

New-London: Printed by T. Green, 1714.

Timothy Green, the brother, — not the nephew, as commonly stated, — of Bartholomew Green, removed from Boston to New London on August 10, 1714 (Sewall's Diary, III. 14). Hence this broadside is an early New London imprint.

IV. After the issue of February 22, 1713-14, is a broadside containing two Resolves of the General Court, — one dated October 14, 1713, the other February 10, 1713[-14], — relating to "Five Town-ships allowed at present . . . in the County of *York*, in the late Province of *Mayne*." The imprint reads: "*BOSTON*: Printed by *B. Green*, Printer to His Excellency the GOV. & COUNCIL. 1713."

V. After the issue of September 20, 1714, is a copy of "The London Gazette. Published by Authority. From Saturday July 31. to Tuesday August 3. 1714," No. 5247. This is a sheet printed on both sides.

VI. The "News-Letter" of October 4 and 11, 1714, each contained an advertisement (p. 2/2) stating that "the Subscribers

in the Partnership for Circulating Bills or Notes, Founded on Land-Security, . . . are desired to meet on Tuesday the 19th Currant, . . . at the Exchange Tavern in Kings-Street Boston." After the issue of October 25, 1714, is a very small sheet headed "*Advertisement*," and ending with these words :

These are to give Notice, That the said | Meeting is Deferr'd unto Monday the First | Day of *November* next Ensuing, at the said | Time and Place. | *Dated, Boston, October 16th. 1714.*

VII. After the issue of October 25, 1714, is a badly mutilated broadside containing "A Proclamation" by Governor Dudley "Requiring all Persons being in Office of Authority or Government at th[e Decease] of the late Queen, to proceed in the Execution of their respective O[ffices]." The date of the Proclamation was, according to Mr. Worthington C. Ford, October 27, 1714.¹

VIII. After the issue of December, 6, 1714, is a broadside printed in two columns signed "J. C." and headed :

Upon the *DEATH* of that *Aged, Pious, Sincere-hearted CHRISTIAN* | *JOHN ALDEN ESQ:* | Late *MAGISTRATE* of New-Plymouth Colony, *who dyed* Sept 12th. 1687. | *being about eighty nine years of age.*

The author was doubtless the Rev. John Cotton (H. C. 1657) of Plymouth, a son of the Rev. John Cotton of Boston.²

IX. and X. After the issue of February 14, 1714-15, are two documents, each a single sheet printed on both sides. One is headed :

My son, fear thou the Lord, | and the King : and meddle not with them that are given | to change, *Proverbs Chap. 24. Verse 21.*

The other is headed :

A DIALOGUE | Between a *Boston* Man and a *Country* Man.

It ends with the words : "PRINTED FOR A PUBLICK GOOD. 1714."

¹ 2 Proceedings, xv. 337.

² The lines were printed, though not from the broadside, in "Pilgrim Alden," edited by Augustine E. Alden, 1902, pp. 110-114. The broadside is reproduced, with facsimile, in "The Mayflower Descendant" (ix. 193-196) for October, 1907.

Both documents relate to the proposed incorporation of Boston in or about 1714, and have been printed by Mr. Worthington C. Ford in the "Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts," X. 345-352.

XI. After the issue of February 21, 1714-15, is a document in four pages headed :

THE | CASE | Of His Excellency the GOVERNOUR and Council | Of the Province of the *Massachusetts-Bay in New-England*, truly Stated.

At the bottom of page 4 is written in ink in Judge Sewall's hand : " This was Printed by Thomas Fleet at Boston March, 14th 1714/15." The document was printed by Mr. Worthington C. Ford in the Proceedings (2d series, XV. 356-362) of this Society for December, 1901.

XII. After the issue of March 28, 1715, is a document in eight pages headed :

Samuel Mulford's | SPEECH | TO THE | ASSEMBLY at NEW-YORK, | April *the Second*, 1714.

The attention of Mr. Wilberforce Eames was called to this document by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, and on November 12, 1901, Mr. Eames wrote Mr. Ford as follows :

I thank you for your note of the 11th inst, enclosing title of Mulford's Speech, which is one of the New York Bradford imprints that Mr. Hildeburn was not able to locate, though he included it in his check list under the year 1714.

XIII. and XIV. After the issue April 11, 1715, are two broadsides. One is headed :

COPY | Of the *Fifth & Sixth* ARTICLES of the Treaty of Neutrality | in *America*, between *England* and *France*, in the Year 1686. | late sent in Orders to His Majesty's Frigots attending the | Government of this Province, to be put in Execution to | Effect.

The imprint reads: "*BOSTON*: Printed by *B. Green*, Printer to his Excellency the GOV. & COUNCIL. 1715."

The other is headed with the Royal Arms and is a Proclamation by Governor Dudley dated March 29, 1715, "Against a Commerce & Trade with the *French* of *Canada*, *Cape Breton*, &c.," and has the same imprint as No. XIII.

M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE presented the following paper :

MORE LETTERS OF WILLIAM VASSALL.

In the second volume of the Bowdoin and Temple Papers (Collections, 7th series, Vol. VI.) there are two letters (pp. 66, 105) to James Bowdoin from William Vassall, who had fled to England, interceding with the Governor to save his property from the effects of confiscation following the Revolutionary War. Three earlier letters from Vassall to Simeon Potter, the leading shipmaster of his time (1720–1806) in Bristol, Rhode Island, especially distinguished for commanding the Bristol boat which took part in the destruction of the *Gaspee*, have recently come to light. It is evident that Vassall was as greatly concerned for his Rhode Island as for his Massachusetts real estate. The letters are now in the possession of Mr. Nathaniel Greene Herreshoff, of Bristol, whose wife was descended from the sister of Simeon Potter, who married Mark Anthony D'Wolf, the first of his name in Rhode Island. By Mr. Herreshoff's permission the letters have been copied for the present purpose.

In substance and expression these letters have much in common with those which Vassall subsequently wrote to Governor Bowdoin. Their reference to his property in Massachusetts, and the fact that when the second letter was written Vassall knew that Potter had moved from Bristol to Swansey and was a member of the Massachusetts legislature, give sufficient reason for reporting them to this Society. It is worth noting that a copy of rhymes in Potter's handwriting preserved by a descendant of one of his sisters contains the couplet:

The man thats called a Tory,
To plague is all my glory,¹

a sentiment which excites wonder at Vassall's choice of a correspondent. In the third letter it will be seen that Vassall, besides stating his case to Potter and many others, appealed to Moses Brown of Providence, who in return promised "his friendly assistance." It was Moses Brown's brother John who in 1781 had bought the Vassall farm in Bristol,² so that

¹ See "The History of Bristol, R. I.," by W. H. Munro, p. 175.

² *Ibid.* p. 244.

the "friendly assistance" must have had its limitations. From John Brown the Vassall farm descended to the Herreshoff family, who still possess it.

WILLIAM VASSALL TO SIMEON POTTER.

CLAPHAM, near LONDON, April 10, 1784

DEAR SIR,—I wrote you March 23 a State of my Case, and requested you would assist me in my endeavours to obtain the restitution of my Bristol farm which had been confiscated & sold. If said letter should miscarry, the following Account will inform you of Facts, and will demonstrate the cruel & unmerited treatment I have met with

I was born in Jamaica, which at the time of my birth was ever since has been, & now is subject to, & under the power & authority of the King of Great Britain; therefore the King of Great Britain is my liege Lord & I am his liege subject; and my natural Allegiance was due to him at my birth, & from my birth to this day, so that I *was born, always have been, and now am a Real British Subject*. I was removed at about 2 years of age from Jamaica to Philadelphia, and at about 4 years of age I was removed to Boston in Massachusetts State, where I was educated & where & in Rhode Island State I have lived between 50 & 60 years from *choice*, because I esteemed the Government & Inhabitants of S^d States: for I was not Engaged in business, and never got on [*sic*] farthing in Either of s^d States, but I expended in s^d States, during my residence in them, near Fifty thousand pounds Sterling, Every farthing of which I received from my Estate in Jamaica: This clearly manifests my friendly disposition to said States. I never did anything unfriendly to Either of s^d States, or to any one of the United States. I never gave, subscribed or promised a single farthing for raising Soldiers, or for or towards any hostile attempt, against the United States. I was neither an Addresser, Protester, or Associater. I was appointed a mandamus Counsellor, without my knowledge, & as soon as I knew it, I refused to accept, & was the First that refused. As soon as hostilities began between Great Britain & the United States, I withdrew with my family from Boston, then in the possession of the King's Troops, to Nantucket. I staid some months at Nantucket, but finding all Intercourse between Jamaica & the United States was intirely cut off by the unhappy War, I removed, not from *choice* but from necessity, to Great Britain, that I might have a communication with my Jamaica Estate, on which I depended intirely for to maintain my family. If I had removed from Nantucket to Jamaica, my Native place, and lived on my plantation, the sole property I had for the maintenance of my family, I should have removed to a place, as much

under the power of the King of Great Britain as any part of the British dominion then was, or now is. The greatest part of my property lay in Jamaica, joined with Great Britain, in open War against the United States, and I had a considerable property in Massachusetts & Rhode Island States, Confederated with the other American States in open War against Great Britain. Being thus situated, I would ask every considerate impartial person, What I, an infirm man upwards of 60 years of age with a large family, could do? I owed natural Allegiance to the King of Great Britain, my liege Lord, and the greatest part of my property lay in Jamaica, absolutely under his power, & subject to his Authority, and I had a considerable property in Massachusetts & Rhode Island States, where I had lived between 50 & 60 years from choice, because those states were agreeable to me, & I had the highest regard & esteem for the Inhabitants, with whom I had lived happily so many years. Under these Circumstances, I greatly lamented the unhappy disastrous War between two powers, to which I bore the greatest good will, and for which I had the highest regard; and prudence, common Sense, Principle & Affection dictated to me, that the only rational and moral part I could act, was to remain Neuter, and to do nothing inimical or unfriendly to either power, which I have religiously Endeavoured to observe. If I have ever deviated from a Neutrality, it has been in favour of the United States, by Refusing to accept the mandamus Counsellorship, Withdrawing from the King's Troops, & putting myself under the protection of the United States.

Yesterday I saw, in the Public Advertiser, a Proclamation issued by Congress, dated Janu^r 14, 1784, Ratifying & confirming the Definitive Treaty in every part & Clause, Requiring & Enjoining all Bodies of Magistracy, Legislative, Executive and Judiciary to conform to it, and to carry it into Execution in Every clause & sentiment: and by an unanimous resolve They earnestly recommand to the several Legislatures, to provide for the restitution of all the Estates Rights & Properties, which have been confiscated, belonging to *Real British Subjects*. I presume the several Legislatures will, from a sense of Justice & for their own honour, Fulfil and Carry into Execution the definitive Treaty, and will, agreeably to the 5. article restore my Estate, to me, for I am a *Real British Subject* as I was born in Jamaica, as is before related. If they do not, I shall be in a much worse situation, than I should be, if I had Accepted the mandamus Counsellorship, & had taken an Active part against the United States; for If I had, I should receive a compensation from the British Government, whereas now I shall not receive any.

I was neither a freeman, nor an Inhabitant of Rhode Island State, but having a pleasant Farm at Bristol in s^d State, I occasionally went to it, and staid a longer, or shorter time, as suited my Convenience :

But Boston, in Massachusetts State was the place of my settled abode ; where I was taxed for my Poll, and personal Estate & Faculty : And before I left America I Let my s^d Farm at Bristol, to Mess. J. Waldron & J. Cushing on shares, That all the business I had in Rhode Island state, was to receive my share of the Income of s^d Farm, as P Agreement, in lieu of Rent : Therefore I owed no personal Services to Rhode Island State, but s^d Mess. Waldron & Cushing were accountable to s^d State, as they improved the Farm, for all Taxes & for all personal services for or on acc^t of my s^d Farm.

Rhode Island State, in confiscating and selling Bristol Farm, has Condemned and Treated me as a Criminal, tho' I have not Committed the least Crime against, nor have violated in any respect Any one of the Laws of said State, as clearly appears by the foregoing State of my Case. Rhode Island State, in Confiscating & Selling my s^d farm, has not punished me, because it is impossible there should be any punishment, where there is no Crime : for punishment is nothing else but the Effect or Consequence of the violation of a penal Law : But said State has *wrongfully* taken my property from me by the *Iron* hand of power, I find by woful Experience and to my great Loss, that there may be power where there is no right, and that power may be arbitrarily exerted, without the least shadow of reason or justice, to take from an innocent person his Estate and property, and to deprive him of His personal Rights. I sincerely wish, Dear Sir, you may never meet with the same cruel & unmerited treatment as I have met with, in having my person proscribed and my property sequestered by Massachusetts State & in having my property seized, confiscated & sold by Rhode Island State, without my having committed the least Offence against, or having violated in any one instance any of the Laws of Either of said States. It is extremely grating to a man of a liberal mind, conscious to himself of his own innocence & integrity, to be obliged to Solicit & petition for, as if it was for a favour, the Restitution of *his own rightful property*, which has been forcibly wrasted from him by a mere Act of arbitrary power. Place yourself in my situation, and Certainly you will feel the Truth and force of this Observation.

I say as St. Paul said on his Trial before Festus, Acts 25, Ch. 8, 10 & 11 Verses, *mutatis mutandis*, where our Cases differ, Neither against the Laws nor the Government of Rhode Island, or any of the United States have I offended anything at all. To Rhode Island State or Any of the United States have I done no Wrong : For *if* I be an *offender* or have *committed* anything *worthy* of *Proscription & Confiscation* of my property, I refuse not *Proscription & Confiscation* of my property but *if I have done nothing worthy* of *Proscription & Confiscation* of my property, *It is impossible* that any Assembly of Men or Government on

Earth should have a *Right* (by *sorrowful* experience *I know* they may have a *power* tho' they have *no Right*) to proscribe my person and to Confiscate my property by *arbitrary ex post facto Laws*. Truth & Justice are Eternal and immutable; They cannot be changed or altered in the least by the Sophistry, Assertions or Laws of fallible Men.

A Gentleman of your Understanding, Sense of justice and liberal way of thinking, must See the absurdity & cruel Injustice of all *ex post facto* Laws, made to punish, or more properly to injure, for Actions done before the existence of such Laws, and which have not been declared Crimes by any preceding Laws, and must detest them as unjust, oppressive and inconsistent with the fundamental Principles of a free State; as it is justly expressed in the declaration of Rights by Massachusetts, Delaware, Maryland & North Carolina States, Cited on the Other Side. I am fully persuaded, that you will cheerfully assist an Injured and Innocent person in his Endeavour to obtain Relief and on this persuasion, I take the liberty to solicit your friendly Aid. I have wrote to D^r William Bradford & William Ellery, Esq^r and requested their friendly assistance. If you will converse with them, probably you and they may think of some measures, which may procure me relief and may Enable me to Obtain the restitution of my Confiscated property. I shall esteem it a favour, if you will write me your opinion as to the measures I had best pursue, and whether you think it is probable that I shall by any means recover my property or not. Your friendly advice & assistance in this affair will be of Essential service to me. Mrs. Vassall & family unite in best regards to you and Mrs. Potter, and I remain with great esteem

Dear sir your most Obed hum Serv

WILLIAM VASSALL.

Massachusetts declaration of Rights, Article 24.

Laws, made to punish for action done before the existence of such Laws, and which have not been declared Crimes by any preceding Laws, are unjust, oppressive, and inconsistent with the fundamental principles of a Free State.

Delaware declaration of Rights, Article 11.

Retrospective laws for punishing Offences committed before the existence of such Laws, are oppressive, Unjust, and ought not to be made.

Maryland declaration of Rights, Article 15.

Retrospective laws, punishing Facts committed before the Existence of such Laws, and by them only declared Criminal, are oppressive, Unjust and incompatible with liberty, Wherefore no *ex post facto* law ought to be made.

North Carolina declaration of Rights, Article 24.

Retrospective Laws, punishing facts committed before the Existence of Such Laws, and by them only declared Criminal, are oppressive, Unjust, and incompatible with liberty, Wherefore no ex post facto Law ought to be made.

I cannot forbear remarking, That it clearly appears by these Citations, That my observations in the foregoing are plain obvious Truths, which forcibly Strike, and irresistibly Convince the human mind. What a pity it is, That the Laws and declarations of Rights in those States are diametrically opposite? How greatly it would have been to the honour of the American United States, If, in their arduous and noble Struggle for *liberty*, Their laws had been made conformable to the plain humane Dictates of *Liberty*, Truth & Justice, as they are Clearly and Nobly expressed and declared in the aforesaid declarations of Rights? I trust & sincerely hope, as Peace is now Established, Passion will Subside, the Voice of Truth and Calm reason will direct, so that all the Irregularities and Wrongs which have been committed, during a time of War and Tumult, will be rectified and redressed, & Justice will be impartially administered to Every One, who has been Injured or Oppressed.

Colo. SIMEON POTTER.

TO SIMEON POTTER.

CLAPHAM near LONDON Aug^t 30, 1784

DEAR SIR, — I wrote to you March 23 and April 15, but have not been favoured with a line from you in answer. Since I wrote my last, I have received a letter from my worthy friend William Ellery Esq^r wherein he informs me that you have removed from Bristol to Swansey and by a late Boston Newspaper I find you are member for Swansey. In my s^d letters I stated my case to you, and I flatter myself, that you think that I have met with Cruel unmerited treatment. As I think I am greatly aggrieved, I have desired John Lowell Esq^r, who is my Counsel, to Exhibit a Petition in my name to the General Court of Massachusetts praying that I may be admitted to the rights of a Citizen, and to Exhibit a memorial, stating therein Facts, and praying that my house in Boston, which has been mortgaged to Mr. P. N. Smith by a Committee of the General Court for security for money he lent the State, may be restored to me free from Mr. Smith[']s mortgage.

I am Certain, That Reason Law & Justice dictate, That no man should be *punished* or suffer the *least* damage in his person or property, Who has not Committed Any Crime. And I am Certain, That I have *not* Committed *any* Crime *against*, nor have violated in *any* respect

Any *One* Either of Massachusetts Rhode Island, or Any *One* of the United States, nor have *Ever* done Any *one* thing in the *least* degree Unfriendly to Any *One* of the United States. Nevertheless Rhode Island State has confiscated & Sold my Farm at Bristol, which cost me £3500 Sterling, And Massachusetts State has proscribed my Person, Sequestered my property, and mortgaged my house in Boston for Security for money borrowed of Mr. P. N. Smith by the State, Which are severe punishments or to speak more properly, are shameful Acts of Injustice, whereby I have been greatly injured. I now bonâ fide declare, That on proof that I have committed *any* Crime against, or have violated in *any* respect Any *One* Law, either of Massachusetts Rhode Island, or Any *One* of the United States, or that I have *Ever* done any *One* thing in the *lowest* degree Unfriendly to Any *One* of the United States, I will relinquish all claims for relief from Rhode Island & Massachusetts States, and will acknowledge that I have no reason to Complain. But if said States cannot prove either of these things against me, I *Rest* my Claim *intirely* on the *Justice* of my cause, that is, that *no* such proof *can* be produced, and should [they] refuse to grant me the relief I pray for in my petitions, they will *Rob* me of my property in a mean dastardly manner, by Exerting the sovereign power of the State wrongfully against an Innocent Individual. I have too high an opinion of the honour and Justice of s^d States to suppose, that they will refuse to give me that relief, which Justice demands that they should give. I have in my afores^d letters given you a full State of my Case, and beg the favour of you, when my petition Comes before Massachusetts Assembly, to support my rightful Cause And to use your Interest to procure me the relief I pray for, that is, that I may be admitted to the Rights of a Citizen, and that my house in Boston may be restored to me free from the Encumbrance of Mr. Smith's mortgage. If you will be so kind as to converse with John Lowell Esq^r who is my Counsel and One of the Senate, and Nath^l Gorham Esq^r Member of the House and my particular friend, you may be able to adopt such a plan as may be successful. You must be sensible, Dear Sir, that when a private person has been oppressed and injured by an Act of a Democratic Legislature, and applies to that same Legislature for Redress, he stands but little chance of succeeding in his application, however just and righteous his Cause is, Unless Gentlemen of distinguished Character Weight and influence Espouse and Support his rightful claim. This, I flatter myself, will appear a reasonable apology for my freedom in soliciting your friendly Aid. I have desired D^r William Bradford & Henry Marchant Esq^r, who were Counsel for me in the Action brought against my bristol farm, to Exhibit to the Gen^l Assembly of Rhode Island, a petition in my name praying for Restitution of my bristol farm. As you are

acquainted with all the principal Gentlemen of Rhode Island State, and know the merits of my claim, you may do me Essential service, by representing my case to the leading members of both Houses, and Engaging them to support my petition when it comes before the Gen^l Assembly, & for which I shall be greatly obliged to you. Mrs. Vassall & family unite in best regards to you & Mrs. Potter, and I remain with Tenders of my best Services and assure I should be happy to have an opportunity to render you any friendly offices,

Dear Sir Y^r Affect hum Serv^t

WILLIAM VASSALL

Col^o SIMEON POTTER.

[Addressed]

Col^o Simeon Potter

Swansey

Massachusetts State

TO SIMEON POTTER.

CLAPHAM near LONDON March 14, 1785

DEAR SIR, — Lately I have received your Esteemed favours of July 10 and Novem 6. In which you express your abhorrence of the wicked proceedings against me — assure me that I stand foremost for the restitution of my property — advise me to come over immediately with my family, and that if I should come, you believe, the Gen^l Court would restore my Estate to me. This would be very pleasing, were it not, that some sullen ill natured facts stare me full in the face & tell me that your friendship for me makes you look only on the favourable side. Some of the facts I will mention. In January 1784 Mr. Tudor my Counsel Exhibited a petition in my name to the Gen^l Court, Praying, that I might be relieved from the Proscription & Confiscation Acts &c. No one Person in the Court spoke in fav^r of my petition, and Mr. Tudor was permitted to withdraw it. In April 1784, Dr. Lloyd Applied, in Consequence of the Act of March 29, 1784, to Governor Hancock & Council, for a licence for me to return, which was refused. In Novem^r 1784 after a violent debate in the House of Representatives, Whether the Absentees who had returned since the Ratification of a definitive Treaty, should be permitted to remain, or not, till the third Wednesday of the next Session of the General Court, it was determined by One Single Vote that they might remain till then. And to mention but one fact more, Viz The infamous Wicked Act of Novem^r 10, 1784, which Enacts, That all the Estates of Absentees, which had been mortgaged by order of Government, should be considered as having been Confiscated to the amount of the sum for which they were mortgaged, and if any Absentee should Sue for his Estate,

the mortgagee should plead the General Issue, and give the Act in Evidence. Now it is a notorious fact, that my Estate Real and personal has not been Confiscated *in toto*, or *in parte*. Nevertheless, though the Jury and Court knew that no part of my Real or personal Estate had been confiscated, upon a Writ of Ejectment for possession of my house in Boston, The General Issue being pleaded And the Act being given in Evidence, The Jury on their Oaths must find, and the Court on their Oaths must adjudge that my house has been confiscated to the amount of the mortgage, that is, The Jury on their Oaths must find and the Court on their Oaths must adjudge a thing or action to have been done, which they knew never had been done. This strange wicked Law Enacts, that falsehoods shall be Truth to my great Injury and heavy loss. When you consider the foregoing, and the great trouble and vast expense that attends the Removing of a large family across the Atlantic, you cannot but see the propriety of my not returning to Boston as things are situated. Notwithstanding the Barbarous, Injurious & Unjust Treatment I have met with from the Legislatures, I have [such] a great fondness for & Attachment to America, That if, by the advices I shall receive from my friends, It shall appear to me that I shall be cordially received and that I may live in the same agreeable manner there that I did formerly, I shall return to my pleasant house in Boston.

I have inquired for Mrs. Grant & am informed that She is in the Country, where I cannot learn, and I am told That she will shortly return to London: As soon as I can find where She is, I will wait on her and talk with her about the Land you mention, and will write you what she says.

I have wrote a full State of my Case in Massachusetts to D^r James Lloyd, Nath^l Gorham Esq^r & W^m Tudor Esq^r, and a full State of my Case in Rhode Island to Moses Brown Esq^r of Providence, & Henry Marchant Esq^r. I have rec^d a very kind letter from Mr. Brown promising me his friendly assistance. I have desired Mr. Marchant to draw a Memorial in my [name] and therein to State the facts I have mentioned in my letter, proving that the Judgment of the Superior Court on the Special Verdict of the Jury, at the Trial at Bristol on the last Monday of Jan^y 1785, Respecting me, is Absurd, Erroneous, & Contrary to Law, and pray therefore that s^d Judgment may [be] nullified and set aside, and that my farm may be restored to me. If you will talk with D^r Lloyd, M^r Gorham & M^r Tudor about my affairs in Massachusetts; and with Moses Brown & Henry Marchant Esq^{rs} about my Affairs in Rhode Island, and Give them your advice & assistance you will do me essential Service, and I shall be greatly obliged to you. Mrs. Vassall and family unite in affectionate regards to you and [Mrs.] Potter, flattering ourselves, that We shall have the pleasure to Renew

our friendly and much Esteemed Acquaintance And I remain with
the greatest Esteem and Respect

Dear Sir Your affect hum^e Serv^t

WILLIAM VASSALL

[Addressed]

Col^o Simeon Potter

At Swansey

Massachusetts State

If he is not at Swansey forward it to him

at Bristol

Rhode Island State

F. B. SANBORN communicated the following paper :

THE EARLY HISTORY OF KANSAS, 1854-1861.

During the present year important additions have been made to the manuscripts relating to the struggle in Kansas, in the six years from 1854 to 1861, between the barbarism engendered by negro slavery and the civilizing forces of free labor, free schools, and free speech. There have also been published and sent to this Society several papers by citizens of Kansas, bearing on the earlier years of this struggle, and correcting some of the errors in history naturally arising, either from the passions or the intrigues of the period in question, or from the forgetfulness or prejudice of later years, when most of the actors in the struggle have passed away. As I was in some sort an actor in the matter for most of the years which these manuscripts and printed papers cover, it seems proper that my statement should be put on record, since it contravenes much that has been spoken and written, in this Society and elsewhere, concerning this momentous period in the civil and military history of the United States. The struggle in Kansas was the prelude, even the rehearsal on a small scale, of the Civil War of 1861-1865; and the questions involved were almost exactly the same, with the exception of those matters of foreign policy which sought to play so large a part in that war.

A disposition is manifest of late, among writers who favor soft names for harsh things, to call our Civil War neither by that name nor by its official title, the "War of the Rebellion," but "The War between the States." It was never, in fact, a war between States, but between institutions,—the so-called "peculiar domestic institution" of negro slavery, and the actual institution of Democracy, resting on free labor, free soil, and free speech. There was never a time during the four

years of warfare when there were not friends of freedom in each of the revolted States, and friends of slavery in each of the loyal States. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers, white and colored, fought for the Union and against negro slavery, whose home was, or had been till they were driven out, in the seceding States. These soldiers came from Virginia, both the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee (to the number of 30,000 or more), Louisiana, Arkansas, and even from Texas. Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland, States on which the supporters of slavery confidently counted, furnished soldiers to both sides, but, on the whole, more to the support of freedom than to the maintenance of slavery. On the other hand, hardly a Northern State that did not send recruits to the Southern armies; while in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and even in New York and New Hampshire, were thousands of pro-slavery Democrats, whose wishes, if not their personal service and money, went to support the losing cause.

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise was the cause of the struggle in Kansas, and that, in turn, was the occasion of disunion and the Civil War. It was expressly declared that the exclusion of slavery from Kansas would be just cause for the South to secede, and this declaration was echoed from Alabama and South Carolina. A vigorous pamphlet lately published by the Secretary of the Kansas Historical Society, George W. Martin, gives the facts and citations on this point. The local leaders in the movement to force slavery upon Kansas were D. R. Atchison, president of the Senate at Washington, and B. F. Stringfellow, both of whom long survived the Civil War,—one dying in 1886 and the other in 1891. Of the former the St. Louis "Democrat," a paper in the interest of Benton and F. P. Blair, said in 1854:

The fraud by which the Missouri Compromise was repealed required to be consummated by another fraud, and a man (Atchison) who made a tool of Douglas for the perpetration of the first fraud, telling him that if he didn't introduce a bill for that purpose that he would resign his position as president of the senate and introduce it himself, has at last found it necessary to resign . . . in order to superintend the perpetration of the second fraud [Martin, p. 9].

Atchison in November, 1854, had made a speech at some point in Platte County, on the Kansas border, to his Missouri constituents. He said:

The people of Kansas, in their first elections, would decide whether or not the slaveholder was to be excluded. . . . What is your duty? When you reside in one day's journey of the Territory, and when your peace, your quiet, and your property depend upon your action, you can, without any exertion, send five hundred of your young men who will vote in favor of your institutions [meaning negro slavery]. Should each county in the State of Missouri only do its duty, the question will be decided quietly and peaceably at the ballot-box.¹

This advice was taken, both then and at the spring election for a territorial legislature, when a thousand Missourians went to vote in Lawrence. By this means a wholly pro-slavery legislature was chosen, which enacted a slave code for Kansas, under which none but pro-slavery men could hold office; and if any person spoke, wrote, or printed his opinion that men had no right to hold slaves in Kansas, he was guilty of felony, and could be imprisoned for two years. This legislature quarrelled with its first Pennsylvania Democratic territorial Governor, and he was forced to flee from Kansas in disguise, in May, 1856. But long before that the killing and expulsion of free-state men had begun, recommended by Atchison and Stringfellow. The newspaper of the latter, called the "Squatter Sovereign," and published at the Kansas town named for Atchison, said (August 28, 1855):

We can tell the impertinent scoundrels of the (New York) *Tribune* that they may exhaust an ocean of ink, their Emigrant Aid Societies spend their millions and billions, their representatives in Congress spout their heretical theories till doomsday, and his excellency Franklin Pierce may appoint abolitionist after free-soiler as governor; yet we will continue to tar and feather, drown, lynch and hang every white-livered abolitionist who dares to pollute our soil [Martin, p. 15].

This threat was carried out as far as power and opportunity permitted. Samuel Collins was killed on October 25, 1855, Charles W. Dow on November 21, and Thomas W. Barber on December 6 following. R. P. Brown was murdered on January 17, 1856. In April following a Vermonter named Baker was taken from his cabin, whipped, hanged to a tree, cut down while living, and released on his promise to leave Kansas. In May a Massachusetts man named Mace was waylaid, and shot and left for dead. Two weeks after, on

¹ See D. W. Wilder's "Annals of Kansas," p. 40.

May 21, 1856, the Lawrence hotel and the offices of two free-state newspapers were destroyed, the Lawrence shops pillaged, and the house of Dr. Charles Robinson, afterwards Governor of Kansas, burned. The next day Preston S. Brooks assaulted, and nearly killed, Charles Sumner in the Senate chamber at Washington. Not one of these crimes was punished, nor did the federal government make any effort to punish them. But John Brown had been in Kansas for six or seven months, and four or five of his sons for a year or two. Forming a small party, consisting of four of his sons, a son-in-law, and two free-state settlers named Townsley and Weiner, he visited the Pottawatomie region, in the present town of Lane, where a gang of ruffians had been insulting and threatening peaceful settlers; there held a sort of drumhead court-martial on five of the offenders, and executed them on the spot.

From that time forward the murders of free-state men did not cease; but they were less common, and a state of active warfare took their place. Brown at the head of a few men attacked and routed a larger force of Missourians and others under the command of a Virginian named Pate, capturing and disarming twenty-three of them, including their captain and lieutenant. This was in June, 1856; in August, with his small force he resisted the attack made by several hundred Missourians upon the small town of Osawatomie; near which the cabins of his sons had been plundered and burnt; and two of them were then in prison as "traitors," but never were brought to trial. A third son was murdered by a Missouri preacher, Martin White, as the invaders came in over the high prairie early in the morning of the Osawatomie fight. The fiftieth anniversary of this skirmish was celebrated in 1906 in the presence of thousands, — the Vice-President of the United States giving one of the addresses. But at an earlier celebration in 1877, when a monument was dedicated to the memory of Brown and his men who fought there, Governor Robinson had made the chief address, and had said:

This is an occasion of no ordinary merit, being for no less an object than to honor and keep fresh the memory of those who freely offered their lives for their fellow-men. The men whose death we commemorate this day cheerfully offered themselves a sacrifice for strangers and a despised race. They would fight injustice wherever found; if framed

into law, then they would fight the law; if upheld and enforced by government, then government must be resisted. The soul of John Brown was the inspiration of the union armies in the emancipation war; and it will be the inspiration of all men in the present and the distant future, who may revolt against tyranny and oppression.

Robinson, however, had not waited one and twenty years to express his satisfaction with Brown's course in Kansas. In September, 1856, a fortnight after the Osawatomie fight, Robinson, writing from Lawrence, gave Brown a letter, which Brown brought to me when he made my acquaintance here in Boston, more than half a century ago, and which ran thus :

CAPTAIN JOHN BROWN.

MY DEAR SIR, — I take this opportunity to express to you my sincere gratification that the late report that you were among the killed at the battle of Osawatomie is incorrect. Your course, so far as I have been informed, has been such as to merit the heartiest praise from every patriot; and I cheerfully accord to you my heartfelt thanks for your prompt, efficient, and timely action against the invaders of our rights and the murderers of our citizens. History will give your name a proud place on her pages; and posterity will pay homage to your heroism in the cause of God and humanity. Trusting that you will conclude to remain in Kansas, and serve during the war the cause you have done so much to sustain; and with earnest prayers for your health, and protection from the shafts of death that so thickly beset your path, I subscribe myself

Very respectfully your obedient servant,

C. ROBINSON.

To this letter, when Brown showed it to me, January 2, 1857, were appended the endorsements of Salmon P. Chase, then Governor of Ohio, and of Gerrit Smith, who had given \$10,000 for the freedom of Kansas.

Now who was Governor Robinson? Born in Worcester County, Massachusetts, and educated as a physician, he had gone to California early to seek his fortune. He became an agent of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, organized in 1854 at the instance of Eli Thayer, Dr. Howe, Dr. Hale, then a young clergyman at Worcester, and other anti-slavery men, but which soon fell into the hands of men like Amos A. Lawrence, J. M. S. Williams, and Judge R. A. Chapman of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, who were not regarded by themselves or the public as fanatical anti-slavery men. One

of the earliest important papers in the collection lately given to this Society by the heirs of Patrick T. Jackson is an early document of the Emigrant Aid Company, which explains the manner of its management of capital. Dr. Robinson was one of several agents who took charge of its business in the Territory of Kansas by which agency he laid the foundation of his considerable fortune. He also became a political leader, in which function his agency materially assisted him, and received from the free-state people of Kansas almost every official title they could confer. As Major-General of the free-state militia in December, 1855, he commissioned John Brown as Captain, and I have, and will submit hereafter, a photographic copy of this document.

How these militia were supplied with the new Sharp's rifle by citizens of Boston has lately been set forth in an interesting paper by Mr. W. H. Isely of Wichita, Kansas, showing the names of the principal subscribers and the amount given by each. In a letter from my college classmate, the late Theodore Lyman, to Mr. Jackson, found among our Jackson Papers, Lyman, then (June 7, 1856) a scientific student, said, "I have already subscribed for saw-mills and rifles," and then enclosed \$50 for Dr. Howe's Faneuil Hall Committee. I met Dr. Robinson, then known as "Governor" under the abortive Topeka Constitution, at a meeting which the State Kansas Committee, successors to the Faneuil Hall Committee, had organized for Robinson in October, 1856, and as a member of that Committee, assisted in collecting the \$325 given at that meeting to the State Committee. At a later date, and in the same capacity, I attended a meeting at which Robinson's chief rival in Kansas, General James H. Lane, spoke in his fervid prairie manner; and for many years after I watched the career of the two men.

Twenty-five years after the death of John Brown, one of his friends in the critical period of Kansas history, the late Amos A. Lawrence, a member of this Society, presented it with early portraits of Brown and Robinson, and in so doing made certain statements which are not, in my judgment, in strict conformity with the ascertained historical facts. Speaking of Charles Robinson, at the May meeting of 1884, Mr. Lawrence said:¹

¹ 2 Proceedings i. 181-183.

Yet he never bore arms. . . . He sternly held the people to their loyalty to the Government [the administration of President Pierce] against the arguments and the example of the "higher law" men, who were always armed, who were not real settlers, and who were bent on bringing about a Border war.

The fact is, Robinson not only "bore arms" in the "Border war," already existing by act of Atchison and his Missouri followers, but he commanded as major-general the free-state militia at Lawrence in the little "Wakarusa war" of December, 1855; and as such he commissioned John Brown to command a company there, consisting in part of Brown's six sons and a son-in-law, who had been real settlers, several of them for a year preceding. Brown, with his usual prudence, had carried along his own arms in October, 1855; but there is a story of the Sharp's rifles which Robinson had received and distributed, which a citizen of Kansas in the present year tells. Mr. Isely, having had access to the Lawrence and Cabot papers, printed this important information in "The American Historical Review" (XII. 546-566) for April, 1907. Till then, although the general facts were known, the details were allowed to remain concealed. There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of these recent revelations. April 2, 1855, six months before John Brown had reached Kansas, Charles Robinson, an agent of the Emigrant Aid Company, wrote to Eli Thayer, an officer of that company, as follows:

Our people have now formed themselves into four military companies, and will meet to drill till they have perfected themselves in the art. Also companies are being formed in other places [than Lawrence, he means], and we want *arms*. Give us the weapons and every man from the North will be a soldier and die in his tracks if necessary, to protect and defend our rights. . . . Cannot your secret society send us 200 Sharps rifles as a loan till this question is settled? Also a couple of field-pieces? . . . I have given our people encouragement to expect something of the kind, and hope we shall not be disappointed.

A week later Robinson sent an almost identical letter to Dr. Hale, then of Worcester, and now a member of this Society; but not content with this, he sent on from Kansas his clerk, George W. Deitzler, who was in the pay of the Emigrant Aid Company, as Robinson was, to hasten the forward-

ing of the arms. Mr. Deitzler, in 1879, in a published speech said :

Within an hour after our arrival in Boston, the executive committee of the Emigrant Aid Company [of which Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Thayer were both members] held a meeting and delivered to me an order for one hundred Sharps rifles and I started at once for Hartford, arriving there on Saturday evening. The guns were packed on the following Sunday and I started for home on Monday morning. The boxes were marked "Books." . . . Those rifles did good service in the "border war." . . . It was perhaps the first shipment of arms for our side.

General Deitzler (such was his rank in the Civil War) may have mistaken a date or two; for my old friend Dr. Webb, dating on May 8th from the office of the Emigrant Aid Company, No. 3 Winter Street, Boston, said, writing to Robinson in Lawrence :

Mr. Deitzler presented himself at this office on Wednesday last [May 2], with a letter from Mr. Thayer relative to a certain business intrusted to him; no one in this *village* having received any advices.

We were busily occupied in getting ready for special meeting No. 2, . . . to see if we could raise funds for more Mills; still considering the exigencies of the case we ventured to lend a helping hand, . . . although by so doing we pushed out . . . our legitimate business. I eventually arranged, with the aid of Dr. Cabot, so as to take the risk of ordering, in all one hundred machines, at a cost of about three thousand dollars, taking our chances hereafter to raise the money. . . .

I am free to say, had your letter . . . arrived forty-eight hours earlier, myself and others would have been little, if at all disposed to exert ourselves, . . . to procure machines for the improvement of Lawrence. Rather we should have seconded the suggestion of one of our most influential coadjutors, which was to advise you and other friends to quit L., abandon it to its impending fate, and seek a location at another spot, where more harmony and good will will be likely to prevail.

It would be curious to know who the influential coadjutor was that suggested abandoning Lawrence. Evidently not Mr. Lawrence; for he appears, by a memorandum in his own handwriting, dated August 24, 1855, to have subscribed \$955 "to make up the sum expended by me for rifles for the defence of the Kansas settlers." The list of these subscribers is in the handwriting of Dr. Samuel Cabot, and shows the follow-

ing names, beside Mr. Lawrence's: John M. Forbes, \$300, Gerrit Smith, \$250, Dr. Cabot, \$240, Wendell Phillips, Dr. W. R. Lawrence, Captain John Bertram of Salem, Samuel A. Eliot, Theodore Lyman, G. Howland Shaw, and Cunningham Brothers, each \$100; Samuel Hoar of Concord, Henry Lee, and Calvin Hall, each \$50; Judge E. R. Hoar, Dr. Le Baron Russell, and P. S. Crowell, each \$25. The total of these subscriptions for the first hundred rifles, exclusive of Mr. Lawrence's, is \$1,715; and it thus appears that, of the whole \$2,670, for which Mr. Lawrence made himself responsible, \$1,055 were paid by the two brothers Lawrence, with one of whom, Dr. Lawrence, I served for years as a member of the State Kansas Committee. Most of the subscribers were either officers or members of the Emigrant Aid Company, and the whole business was transacted at the office of that company in Winter Street.

One of the last shipments of rifles, in the spring of 1856, was seized, on board the Missouri river steamboat *Arabia*, by a thousand armed Missourians at Lexington, and for some years kept out of the hands of the Kansas free-state men. D. S. Hoyt, of Deerfield, Massachusetts, who had charge of them, returned to St. Louis, libelled the steamer for the value of the rifles, and collected the money; but the rifles remained useless in the custody of the Missourians. Mr. Lawrence wrote: "If we were not officers of the Emigrant Aid Company, we could get them by suit; but whether we can do so by proxy remains to be seen."

A few months later Hoyt was murdered on the plains of Kansas; and Brown, in his address to the Massachusetts legislature in February, 1857, said, "In August last I saw the mangled and shockingly disfigured body of the murdered Hoyt of Deerfield brought into our camp." The hundred rifles were finally recovered by the Emigrant Aid Company in the early part of 1859, and at the request of Martin Conway, an agent of the company, some time in the spring of 1859 were turned over to Captain James Montgomery, and employed by him in 1860, during the border troubles at Fort Scott. Montgomery, a year earlier, using probably some of the rifles sent out from Boston in 1855, had, when pursued by United States dragoons in southern Kansas, turned upon them and put them to flight, killing two dragoons. This was the first and last time that

the national soldiers were fired on or forcibly resisted by the free-state men of Kansas. Colonel Montgomery afterward commanded a Kansas regiment in the Civil War, and a colored regiment recruited among the freedmen of Carolina. After all his perils and exposures he outlived the wars, small and great, and died quietly in his bed at Mound City in Kansas. His portrait (the only one known) will be hereafter submitted. He visited me at Concord in 1857, and was introduced by me to Emerson, and to the scene of the Concord fight of 1775. His grandfather had fought among the New Hampshire troops at Bunker Hill; his great-grandfather was out in the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, and had to emigrate from Scotland, — first to Ireland and then to New England. My friend himself was a slender, dark-complexioned person, of a certain elegance both of person and speech, reminding me of a French chevalier.

Other rifles than the lot already mentioned were sent out from Boston by the officers of the Emigrant Aid Company, in August, 1855, and later. The whole sum recorded by Dr. Cabot, as raised for this purpose, was \$12,444. Whether the list given above of the subscribers to a hundred rifles relates to those sent in May, or those of August, is left in doubt by Mr. Isely, but I think I am not wrong in applying it to the May shipment. The August shipment was also solicited by Robinson, through Major Abbott, and the request was granted by Mr. Lawrence, who wrote (August 11 and 20, 1855) as follows to Major J. B. Abbott:

Request Mr. Palmer to have one hundred Sharps rifles packed in casks, like hardware, and to retain them subject to my order. Also to send the bill to me by mail. I will pay it either with my note, according to the terms agreed on between him and Dr. Webb, or in cash less interest at seven per cent. per annum.

[August 20.] This installment of carbines is far from being enough; and I hope the measures you are taking will be followed up until every organized company of trusty men in the Territory shall be supplied. . . .

You must dispose of these where they will do the most good, and for this purpose you should advise with Dr. Robinson and Mr. Pomeroy.

I cannot find that John Brown, who certainly had an "organized company of trusty men," made use of any of the rifles of 1855. He had supplied himself with arms in the early summer of 1855, on his way to Kansas with his son-in-law,

Henry Thompson, who is yet living at Pasadena, California. Writing from Syracuse, New York, June 28, 1855, Brown said to his family at North Elba:

I have met with a most warm reception from all, so far as I know, and (except by a few sincere, honest peace friends) a most hearty approval of my intention of arming my sons and other friends in Kansas. I received to-day donations amounting to a little over \$60, — \$20 from Gerrit Smith, \$5 from an old British officer:¹ others giving smaller sums, with such earnest and affectionate expression of their good wishes as did me more good than money, even.

In Akron he received gifts for arms, and also the artillery sabres which were afterwards used by his men in the Pottawatomie executions, the following May; together with some infantry bayonets, too large to fit any of the Kansas muskets, but which he fastened to wooden handles, intending to use them as pikes to repel attack. With these, set up in a row on each side of his great wagon, he crossed the line of the invading Missourians in December, 1855, when he led his six sons to the Wakarusa war, and received at Lawrence his commission from Major-General Robinson.

In a later communication I shall speak of the Emigrant Aid Society and its useful work in Kansas for a few years. It had less to do with the pioneer settlement and the final triumph of freedom in Kansas than we used to claim; but its task was well performed, on the whole, and its agents at times rendered good service.

SAMUEL A. GREEN presented a photographic copy of a silhouette of Joseph Willard, President of Harvard University from 1781 to 1804, the gift of his grandchildren, Mr. Joseph Willard and Miss Susanna Willard; and he also communicated the following extract of a letter from a great-granddaughter, Miss Theodora Willard, dated at Cambridge on July 31, 1907:

As far as we know there are three originals, — one belonging to us, one to Harvard, and one to another branch of the family. The picture I brought to you last week is a photographic reproduction from our original, enlarged to just twice the size. My aunt and uncle had eight of these made, — one for you, one which has been framed in the

¹ Captain Charles Stewart, who had served under Wellington.

same way and lately given to Harvard, and six for Mr. Henry W. Cunningham. . . . They also had fourteen copies, made the exact size of the original, for themselves and for various relatives; and also two more copies, four times the size of the original, — one my aunt has kept, the other she had framed and lent to the exhibit of historical pictures, &c., sent to the Jamestown Exposition by the Colonial Dames. These very large copies are not as satisfactory as the smaller ones.

At the request of Professor NORTON, Dr. Green also presented, in the name of Mrs. J. A. Swan of Cambridge, two water-color drawings which represent a part of Summer and of Winter Streets, giving excellent views of Trinity Church as it formerly appeared. They are by the English artist Vautin, who resided in Boston for some years, near the middle of the last century, and gave instruction in drawing which was much esteemed. One of these water-colors is dated 1846, and the other was made a few years later. They are now given to the Society by the lady who has owned them ever since they were painted, and from whose pencil sketch one of them was made. She is the widow of the Rev. Joshua A. Swan (H. C. 1846), the daughter of the late Rev. R. M. Hodges (H. C. 1815), the sister of Dr. Hodges (H. C. 1847), and the mother of Mrs. Governor Russell.

GRENVILLE H. NORCROSS presented the following note:

In the "Report on Canadian Archives" by Douglas Brymner, Archivist, for the year 1889, which contains the Private Diary of General Sir Frederick Haldimand, — in the original French and in an English translation, — Mr. Brymner calls attention to a passage in the Diary as follows:

At page 213 of the diary, as printed in this Report, is a curious contribution to the history of the Yorktown capitulation, a strike among the carpenters in New York having delayed for a fortnight the departure of the fleet intended to co-operate with Cornwallis.

The entry in Haldimand's Diary, made probably in 1786, as translated in the Report, is as follows:

He [Robertson] is certain that he [Low] was among the first who returned to America, but afterwards was among the ranks of the government party and was very useful. Robertson¹ gave me a striking instance

¹ James Robertson (1720?–1788), Royal Governor of New York, 1779–1783, rose from the ranks until he became Lieutenant-General in 1782.

of this. Our fleet which was at New York, required immediate repair in order to set sail to protect Lord Cornwallis; there were not enough of workmen in the yard. Robertson proposed to collect all the carpenters and put them in charge of Mr. Low, who found a great many of them. But those in the yard would not receive them, so that the fleet lost a fortnight by the delay, which was partly the cause of Cornwallis' misfortune. This anecdote is little known. This same Mr. Low engaged about 300 or 400 men in the Admiral's fleet when it set sail.

Haldimand (1718-1791), a Swiss in the service of England, was the general to whom the Boston Latin School boys protested against the destruction of their coast on Beacon Street in 1775. He was Governor of Canada from 1778 to 1784.

The President presented, in behalf of Mr. William G. Brooks, a volume by John Cotton entitled "Practical Commentary, or an Exposition . . . upon The First Epistle Generall of John (London, 1656), containing the bookplate of his brother Phillips Brooks, a descendant of Cotton.

The Council reported the appointment of Messrs. Charles C. Smith, Grenville H. Norcross, and Samuel S. Shaw as House Committee.